

12 August 1964

MEMORANDUM FOR: Executive Assistant/Director of Personnel
FROM : Chief, Personnel Recruitment Division
SUBJECT : Supplementary Suggestions Resulting from IG Survey
of the Office of Personnel

1. Your memorandum, above subject, dated 28 July 1964, requests comments and suggestions for incorporation in the Director of Personnel's report to the Inspector General. My comments follow:

Dispersal of Office of Personnel Components - Insofar as the WRO location at 1016-16th Street is concerned I would say that under no circumstances should it be moved to Headquarters Building. In my FY 64 Annual Report, at page 13, I made the following comment: Over the years our Washington Recruitment Office has been consistently the most productive source of new employees for the Agency. Manned by four full-time interviewers, including C/WRO [REDACTED] and two backstops, this downtown office consistently has been the doorway to Agency employment for some third of all EOD's.

25X1A

Oft heard rumors of the Agency losing its 1016-16th Street, N. W., lease, or threatening otherwise to relocate the occupants, always strike fear in the souls of those who know the value of this location to Recruitment. No location in the Greater Washington area would give us the same returns. Stated differently, relocation of this office would be justified only on the basis of necessity and would then require, as a matter of first priority, that an equally good downtown, first-floor new office location be in readiness for WRO occupancy.

As to the location of PRD Headquarters in the Broyhill Building I also consider this in many ways an ideal location, particularly because it gives us the closest possible contact with the COTP and the A&E Staff. Since the COTP is our major recruitment customer, I believe there is a definite advantage to our remaining

DOC 3 REV DATE 20/04/82 BY 103877
ORIG COMP CPI 32 TYPE 01
ORIG CLASS Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP80-01826R001100090011-3
JUST *[Signature]* NEXT REV 20/01 AUTH: HR 70-2
[REDACTED]

GROUP 1
Excluded from automatic
downgrading and
declassification

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/07/12 : CIA-RDP80-01826R001100090011-3

SUBJECT: Supplementary Suggestions Resulting from IG Survey of the Office of Personnel

in the Brophy Building even though it works a considerable burden upon Chief, PRD, in commuting to Headquarters for regularly scheduled meetings and other appointments. As for the other elements of the Office of Personnel currently situated away from Headquarters, I can visualize no possible advantages for these offices in their present location and they should indeed be regrouped in Headquarters whenever the opportunity permits.

Personnel Recruitment Division - My responses to the four (4) questions presented under this caption are spelled out in the attached copy of C/PRD Memorandum (FY 65-9) and constitute my considered opinion, subject to any subsequent modification I may furnish you based upon what our professional recruiters may suggest. With respect, however, to Item 5 regarding ORR I am attaching additional materials to support my statement that we have gone more than halfway in meeting ORR in that Office's desire to send its own officers to the campus provided its visits are coordinated with the Office of Personnel.

Clandestine Services Personnel Division (CSPD) - I have no particular comment to make with respect to the points raised by the IG survey although I would suggest, with respect to Item 7, that the Office of Personnel should support CSPD in the matter of providing appropriate offices for private discussions.

Benefits and Services Division - I would endorse the three (3) recommendations made by the IG survey. Items 8 and 10 speak for themselves. As to Item 9, the Honor and Merit Awards Program, I too feel that it is underused as a tool of recognition and incentive, especially in an Agency whose career services, by and large, insist upon a life of anonymity. Surely, each career service is capable of recognizing outstanding service or the occasional unique contribution within its functional areas, yet we seem lethargic or stingy when it comes to reducing such recognition to tangible terms. I am not for a proliferation of honor and merit awards of the garden variety, "Happy Birthday" ilk, but rather, a more enlightened and wider use of the QSI, when this is called for; the simple memorandum of appreciation (for the individual's file); a more intensive effort to encourage Suggestions and a more liberal response, be it cash or simply a letter from the Director, to any employee--by way of encouraging him to make additional suggestions. In other words, I think we do a good job in terms of the higher cash awards, but that we may not be doing enough to thank or "tip" (\$5) the individual whose original suggestion, if

~~SECRET~~

SUBJECT: Supplementary Suggestions Resulting from IG Survey of the Office of Personnel

it is original, has some merit whether or not it is adopted. Quite frankly, I get the feeling we go all out for the big pay-off in competing within Government for recognition for the outstanding performance of our top officials. But are we really keeping constantly in mind that the little guy, and not quite so little guy, would like a little more intra-Agency frosting on his cake too.

Fitness Reports - This same comment could have been leveled at the JOTP. As I understood their fitness report ratings of in-training JOT's a year ago, "adequate" had quite a different meaning than I had known it to have elsewhere in the Agency. It was, in fact, the equivalent of "proficient" wherever I had seen "proficient" applied. This may have been changed by now, but for many personnel brought into the Agency through the JOTP I sensed that their first rating would be the worst they would ever receive, despite high selection standards and the fact their performance, in a training situation, was analogous to the academic institution at which they had earned a much higher "grade."

25X1A

Attachments: A/S

MISSING PAGE

ORIGINAL DOCUMENT MISSING PAGE(S):

Attachment